arXiv:1211.4535v1 [math.DS] 19 Nov 2012

Singular values and bounded Siegel disks

Anna Miriam Benini
CRM Ennio de Giorgi
Piazza dei Cavalieri 3
56100 Pisa, Italy
ambenini@gmail.com

Núria Fagella*
Dept. de Mat. Aplicada i Anàlisi
Univ. de Barcelona, Gran Via 585
08007 Barcelona, Spain
fagella@maia.ub.es

November 20, 2012

Abstract

Let f be an entire transcendental function and Δ be a forward invariant bounded Siegel disk for f with rotation number in Herman's class $\mathcal{H}$. We show that if f belongs to a certain wide class of entire functions, the boundary of Δ contains a critical point, provided that there are only two singular values interacting with the Siegel disk. We also prove several general results on the mapping properties of entire functions and on the relation between preimages of sets and the presence of singular values. These include a weak form of Mañé's Theorem according to which the boundary of a bounded Siegel disk must be accumulated by the orbit of a recurrent critical point.

Introduction

We consider the dynamical system generated by the iterates of an entire transcendental function $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$, that is a function which is holomorphic on the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ and has an essential singularity at infinity (in general, we will omit the word 'transcendental'). In this setup, there is a dynamically natural partition of the phase space into two completely invariant subsets: the *Fatou set* $\mathcal{F}(f)$, formed by those $z \in \mathbb{C}$ for which the family of iterates $\{f^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is normal in the sense of Montel in some neighborhood of z; and the *Julia set* $\mathcal{J}(f)$, its complement. Orbits in the Julia set exhibit chaotic behavior – in fact, $\mathcal{J}(f)$ is the closure of the repelling periodic points of f.

The Fatou set is open and orbits in the Fatou set are stable in some sense. The periodic components of $\mathcal{F}(f)$ are completely classified into basins of attraction of attracting or parabolic cycles, Siegel disks (topological disks on which a certain iterate of f is conjugate to a rigid irrational rotation of angle θ, called the *rotation number*) or Baker domains (regions on which iterates converge uniformly to infinity). Non-periodic components of the Fatou set are called preperiodic if they are eventually mapped to a periodic component, and wandering otherwise. Baker and wandering domains are types of Fatou components which appear only in the transcendental setting.

---

[*] Partially supported by the catalan grant 2009SGR-792 and by the spanish grant MTM2011-26995- C02-02.

In holomorphic dynamics, the *singular values* of f play a crucial role. A singular value of f is a point around which not all branches of f^{-1} are well defined and univalent (see Section 1.2). A singular value s is a *critical value* if $s = f(c)$ where c is a point with vanishing derivative or *critical point.* If f is transcendental a second kind of singular value is allowed: s is an *asymptotic value* if there exists a curve tending infinity (the essential singularity) whose image under f is a bounded curve converging to s. Morally, asymptotic values concentrate infinitely many preimages at infinity. We denote

$$S(f) = \{s \in \mathbb{C};\ s \text{ is a singular value for } f\}.$$

Observe that $S(f)$ is closed because any accumulation point of singular values is itself a singular value (more precisely an asymptotic value), and that $f : \mathbb{C} \setminus f^{-1}(S(f)) \to \mathbb{C} \setminus S(f)$ is a covering of infinite degree.

Our primary goal in this paper is to study the relation between bounded Siegel disks and singular values in the transcendental setting. To that end, we also develop some results about entire functions which apply to many different settings than our own. One example is the following proposition, contained in Section 1.3.

Proposition 1 (Unbounded preimages of bounded sets). *Let f be an entire function, $V \subset \mathbb{C}$ a bounded simply connected open set, and $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ an unbounded connected component of $f^{-1}(V)$. Then, either $\overline{V}$ contains an asymptotic value, or U contains infinitely many critical points and V contains at least two critical values.*

All types of Fatou components are somehow associated with a *singular orbit* (the orbit of a singular value). For example, all basins of attraction must contain at least one singular orbit which accumulates on the periodic cycle. Siegel disks cannot contain critical points although they may contain asymptotic or critical values if these have regular preimages which are contained in the cycle of Siegel disks. On the other hand the boundary of a Siegel disk must be in the accumulation set of one or more singular orbits. The relation of $S(f)$ with wandering or Baker domains is not as well understood but, if f is an entire function with finitely many singular values, neither wandering domains nor Baker domains exist ([EL, GK]). Likewise, if f belongs to the Eremenko-Lyubich class $\mathcal{B}$ of entire functions for which $S(f)$ is bounded, then f has no Baker domains, nor any wandering domains for which the iterates converge uniformly to infinity [EL]. Wandering domains which oscillate are possible [Bi], and wandering domains with bounded orbit have not yet been discarded.

From now on, let Δ be a bounded invariant Siegel disk with rotation number θ. The results in this paper can be generalized to cycles of bounded Siegel disks, but we chose to consider the fixed case to keep the exposition simpler. As much as the dynamics on Δ is well understood, the dynamics on its boundary is not, and it very much depends on the rotation number θ, and in some instances, on the dynamics of f outside of Δ. It is not known up to today, even in polynomial or rational dynamics, whether $\partial\Delta$ is always a Jordan curve. In transcendental dynamics, Siegel disks may have non-locally connected boundaries due to the presence of an asymptotic value in the boundary which makes the disk unbounded. In the case of bounded disks however, no example has been found yet for which the boundary is not a Jordan curve.

For any singular value $s \in S(f)$ we denote by $\omega(s)$ its ω-limit set, that is the set of accumulation points of the sequence $\{f^n(s)\}_n$. As mentioned above, a theorem of Fatou [Mi] states that

$$\partial\Delta \subset \bigcup_{s \in S(f)} \omega(s).$$

In fact, if f is a rational function, Mañé [Ma3] proved that the boundary of Δ needs to be in the accumulation set of *a recurrent* critical point, that is a critical point whose orbit accumulates on itself. This theorem is not yet known to be true for general entire functions although it has been proven for entire functions with finitely many singular values [RvS, Corollary 2.9]. In Section 2, under some additional hypothesis, we prove the following version of Mañé's theorem which is sufficient for our purposes.

Proposition 2 (Fatou variation). Let f be an entire transcendental map with a bounded invariant Siegel disk Δ. Suppose f has a finite set of singular values all of which are on $\partial\Delta$. Then there is a recurrent critical point on $\partial\Delta$.

Remark. Proposition 2 is also true if f has infinitely many singular values, as long as only a finite number of them are on $\partial\Delta$ and the others do not interact with the Siegel disk (see a precise definition later on).

Observe that this implies that if an entire map has finitely many singular values interacting with a Siegel disk Δ, all of which are on $\partial\Delta$, and if f has no recurrent critical points, then Δ is unbounded, even if the asymptotic values have preimages in $\mathbb{C}$.

It is of interest to know whether and when the boundary of Δ actually contains a critical point or a singular value. Again, this depends strongly on the arithmetic properties of the rotation number. An important set of rotation numbers is the set of Herman numbers $\mathcal{H}$ defined as the set of $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that every orientation preserving analytic diffeomorphism of the circle is analytically linearizable, that is, analytically conjugate to the rigid rotation $\mathcal{R}_\theta$. This set was proven to be nonempty by Herman [He1] who showed that it contains all diophantine numbers, and was later described arithmetically by Yoccoz [Yo].

The two issues mentioned above, the topological nature of $\partial\Delta$ and whether it contains a critical point are related to each other. A classical (local) theorem of Ghys [Gh] states that if $\theta \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\partial\Delta$ is a Jordan curve then, independently of the nature of f outside the disk, $\partial\Delta$ contains a critical point. There are many instances for which it is proven that the boundary of a Siegel disk is a Jordan curve and contains a critical point. This is the case for example if the rotation number is of bounded type (that is, Diophantine of order 2) *and* f is a polynomial [Gh, D, S, He3, Z1] or a rational map [Zh] or a map of the form $\lambda z e^{P(z)}$ with P a polynomial [Z2]. Regarding entire transcendental maps Rempe [Re] proved some results concerning the presence of singular *values* in $\partial\Delta$ for functions in class $\mathcal{B}$ such that $S(f) \subset \mathcal{J}(f)$. Other related results can be found in [GS] (for rotation numbers of bounded type) and in [BeF].

Our main goal is, assuming that Δ is a *bounded* Siegel disk, to determine under which circumstances we can ensure that $\partial\Delta$ contains a critical point, without assuming that $\partial\Delta$ is a Jordan curve. This question was first addressed by Herman [He2] who, based on Ghys' ideas, developed a general theorem about extensions of holomorphic maps which leave invariant a rotation annulus with rotation number in $\mathcal{H}$. He used this result to prove some interesting corollaries.

Theorem (Herman)**.**

(a) *Let f be a holomorphic map on a domain $U \subset \mathbb{C}$, and Δ be a bounded invariant Siegel disk for f with rotation number $\theta \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\overline{\Delta} \subset U$. Then there is a critical point in $\partial\Delta$ provided $f|_{\partial\Delta}$ is injective.*

(b) *If $f(z) = z^d + c$ with $d \geq 2$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$ has a Siegel disk Δ with rotation number $\theta \in \mathcal{H}$, then $\partial\Delta$ contains a critical point.*

(c) *If $f(z) = \lambda e^z$ with $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ has a Siegel disk Δ with rotation number $\theta \in \mathcal{H}$, then Δ is unbounded.*

Observe that the theorems above have no assumption (nor claim) on the topology of $\partial\Delta$. Our source of inspiration is the step taken by Chéritat and Roesch [CR] towards a generalization of Herman's Theorem on unicritical polynomials (part (b)).

Theorem (Chéritat-Roesch)**.** *Let P be a polynomial with two critical points, and Δ be an invariant Siegel disk with rotation number in $\mathcal{H}$. Then $\partial\Delta$ contains a critical point.*

Our goal is to study this problem in the case of entire functions having a bounded invariant Siegel disk Δ. Although in some cases we reduce locally to the polynomial setting, in general we must take into account the very different nature of f provided by its essential singularity at infinity. The infinite degree and the presence of asymptotic values give rise to many more possibilities than those found in the polynomial setup.

Let $\widehat{\Delta}$ be the complement of the unique unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\Delta}$. If the boundary of Δ is a Jordan curve, $\widehat{\Delta} = \overline{\Delta}$. In general we allow f to have infinitely many singular values, although in many cases only a finite subset is allowed to interact with Δ.

Definition We say that only a finite set of singular values $S_\Delta = S_\Delta(f) \subset S(f)$ is *interacting with* Δ if the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) $\omega(s) \cap \widehat{\Delta} \neq \emptyset$ for all $s \in S_\Delta$;

(b) $\overline{\bigcup_{s \in S(f) \setminus S_\Delta} \omega(s)} \cap \widehat{\Delta} = \emptyset$, and

(c) the singular values in $S(f) \setminus S_\Delta$ do not accumulate on $\partial\Delta$.

Observe that escaping singular values, as well as singular values which belong to preperiodic Fatou components whose closure is disjoint from $\partial\Delta$, are non-interacting (if they are in wandering domains, they could). Also note that if $S(f)$ is finite then all three conditions above are automatically satisfied.

Observe that escaping singular values, as well as singular values which belong to Fatou components whose orbit's of the closure is disjoint from $\partial\Delta$, are non-interacting. Also note that if $S(f)$ is finite then the conditions above are automatically satisfied.

To prove our main theorem we need to use the fact that, under some additional assumptions on f, the boundaries of two distinct periodic Fatou components intersect in at most one point. This was shown to be true for polynomials with a connected Julia set [GM] and also for entire functions under certain conditions [BF]. We refer to this property as *periodic Fatou components can be separated.* The actual condition is a bit technical and will be clarified in Section 1.4 but, for functions of finite order, it is implied by a variety of conditions, the simplest (and strongest) of which is to assume, for example, that the union of all singular orbits forms a bounded set (see [Re],[F] and Prop. 1.9).

We are now ready to state our main theorem.

Main Theorem. *Let f be an entire function such that periodic Fatou components can be separated and f has no wandering domains. Suppose f has a bounded invariant Siegel disk Δ with rotation number $\mathcal{H}$, and such that only two singular values are interacting with Δ. Then there is a critical point on $\partial\Delta$.*

The main theorem is proven by subdividing it into three cases, each of which requires different hypothesis. In particular, only in the last case we need to be able to separate Fatou components . We list the three independent results here.

Proposition 3 (All singular values outside)**.** *Let f be an entire map with a bounded Siegel disk Δ of rotation number θ, and suppose $S(f) \cap \widehat{\Delta} = \emptyset$. Then*

- *(a) $\theta \notin \mathcal{H}$ (Herman);*
- *(b) If furthermore periodic Fatou components can be separated, and there are no wandering domains in $\widehat{\Delta}$, then $\partial\Delta$ is a Jordan curve.*

The first statement is actually due to Herman as an easy consequence of his theorem stated above (part (a)). The second statement is a transcendental counterpart of [Ro, Theorem 3.1]. In the transcendental case, additional hypothesis are needed to take care of the greater varieties of behaviours which may occur.

With a similar proof to the Fatou variation stated above we obtain the following.

Theorem 4 (All singular values inside)**.** *Let f be an entire map with a bounded invariant Siegel disk Δ. Suppose that there are only finitely many singular values interacting with Δ, all of which are contained in $\widehat{\Delta}$, and that there are no wandering domains in $\widehat{\Delta}$. Then there is a critical point on $\partial\Delta$.*

The final case completes the proof of the Main Theorem for functions with only two singular values interacting with Δ.

Theorem 5 (One inside one outside)**.** *Let f be an entire transcendental map with no wandering domains which has a bounded invariant Siegel disk Δ with rotation number $\theta \in \mathcal{H}$. Suppose that f has only two interacting singular values v, v', and that periodic Fatou components can be separated. If there is exactly one singular value v in $\widehat{\Delta}$, then $v \in \partial\Delta$ and there is a critical preimage c of v on $\partial\Delta$.*

Recall that if f has only finitely many singular values, the absence of wandering domains is automatic.

The paper is organized as follows. We first introduce and prove some results related to topology and to singularities of entire functions, as well as describe the conditions under which periodic Fatou components can be separated; in the meantime, we prove Proposition 1. We then prove Proposition 3, Theorem 4 and the Fatou Variation. Finally, we prove Theorem 5, which also concludes the proof of the Main Theorem.

Acknowledgments

We are very thankful to Arnaud Chéritat and Pascale Roesch for sharing with us the ideas of their work on bicritical polynomials, as well as their manuscript which led to this present work. We are also thankful to Walter Bergweiler for suggesting the statement of Proposition 1 and to him and Misha Lyubich for valuable conversations about Section 1.3.

1 Preliminaries and tools

1.1 Hats and hidden components

We start by stating and proving some of the basic properties of hats. By *component* of a set X we mean a connected component of X.

For a bounded set X, $\widehat{X}$ is defined as the complement of the unbounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{X}$. By definition $\widehat{X}$ is full.

Proposition 1.1 (Properties of hats)**.** *Let X, Y be bounded subsets of $\mathbb{C}$, V be a simply connected neighborhood of X. Then the following facts hold:*

1. $Y \subset \widehat{X} \Rightarrow \overline{Y} \subseteq \widehat{X} \Rightarrow \widehat{Y} \subseteq \widehat{X}$.

2. *Let g be a univalent function defined in V. Then $\widehat{g(X)} = g(\widehat{X})$.*

3. *Let f be an entire function and assume that there are no singular values in $V \setminus \widehat{X}$. Let U be a bounded connected component of $f^{-1}(V)$. By $f^{-1}|_U(X)$ we mean the union of the preimages of X which are contained in U. Then*

$$\widehat{f^{-1}|_U(X)} = f^{-1}|_U(\widehat{X})$$

.

Most of these facts in some form can be found in [CR] but we include the proofs here for completeness.

Proof. 1. This follows because $\widehat{X}$ is both closed and full.

2. Observe that

$$\widehat{g(X)} = \overline{g(X)} \cup \left\{\text{bounded components of } \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{g(X)}\right\}$$
$$\widehat{X} = \overline{X} \cup \left\{\text{bounded components of } \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{X}\right\}.$$

   We first show that $\widehat{g(X)} \subseteq g(\widehat{X})$. If $z \in \overline{g(X)}$, $g^{-1}(z) \in \overline{X}$ because g is a homeomorphism hence $g^{-1}(z) \in \widehat{X}$ and $z \in g(\widehat{X})$. If z is in a bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{g(X)}$ then $g^{-1}(z)$ belongs to a bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{X}$ by the maximum principle hence $g^{-1}(z) \in \widehat{X}$ and $x \in g(\widehat{X})$.

   We now show that $\widehat{g(X)} \supseteq g(\widehat{X})$. If $z \in g(\widehat{X})$ then $g^{-1}(z) \in \widehat{X}$. If $g^{-1}(z) \in \overline{X}$ then $z \in g(\overline{X}) = \overline{g(X)}$ because g is a homeomorphism, hence $z \in \widehat{g(X)}$. Otherwise $g^{-1}(z)$ is in a bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{X}$ hence z is in a bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{g(X)}$ and $z \in \widehat{g(X)}$.

3. Let $\{X_i\}_i$ be the components of $f^{-1}(X)$ which are contained in U, and $X' = \cup_i X_i = f^{-1}|_U(X)$. By definition $f(X') = X$. Because $f : U \to V$ is proper, $\partial X' = \cup_i \partial X_i$, $f(\partial X') = \partial X$ and $f(\overline{X}') = \overline{X}$.

   We first show that $\widehat{X'} \subseteq f|_U^{-1}(\widehat{X})$. If $z \in \overline{X'}$, $f(z) \in \overline{X}$ because g is proper hence $f(z) \in \widehat{X}$ and $z \in f|_U^{-1}(\widehat{X})$ by definition. If z is in a bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{X'}$ then since f has no poles and is proper $f(z)$ belongs to a bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{X}$ hence $f(z) \in \widehat{X}$. Then by definition of $f|_U^{-1}(\widehat{X})$, $z \in f|_U^{-1}(\widehat{X})$.

   We now show that $\widehat{X'} \supseteq f|_U^{-1}(\widehat{X})$. If $z \in f|_U^{-1}(\widehat{X})$ then $f(z) \in \widehat{X}$. If $f(z) \in \overline{X}$, then $z \in \overline{X'} \subset \widehat{X'}$ because f is proper. Otherwise $f(z)$ is in a bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{X}$; by the maximum principle z is in a bounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{X'}$ and $z \in \widehat{X'}$.

□

Consider now an invariant Siegel disk Δ. Because Δ is forward invariant, $\partial\Delta$ also is. The bounded components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\Delta}$ are called *hidden components* and are denoted by H_i. Hidden components (see [He2]) are Fatou components, because $\partial H_i \subset \partial\Delta$ and $f(\partial\Delta) = \partial\Delta$; so by the maximum principle the family of iterates on H_i is bounded hence normal. Also the images of hidden components are contained in $\widehat{\Delta}$, so $\widehat{\Delta}$ is forward invariant. As a consequence, it is easy to check that $\partial\Delta = \partial\Delta_\infty$ where Δ_∞ denotes the unbounded component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \widehat{\Delta}$. This striking fact does not imply a priori that there are no hidden components, as shown in the lakes of Wada constructions (see [Yn]). Examples of Siegel disks with hidden components have never been found, however, their existence has not been disproved either.

1.2 Singularities of entire functions

For the following classification of singularities see [BE] and [Iv].

Proposition 1.2 (Classification of singularities)**.** *Let f be an entire function, $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $D(z,r)$ be the disk of radius r centered at z. For any r let U_r be a component of $f^{-1}(D(a,r))$, chosen such that $U_r \subset U_{r'}$ if $r < r'$. Then only two cases are possible:*

(a) $\bigcap_r U_r = \{p\}, p \in \mathbb{C}$

(b) $\bigcap_r U_r = \emptyset$

In case (a)*,* $f(p) = z$*, and either* $f'(p) \neq 0$ *and* z *is a regular point, or* $f'(p) = 0$ *and* z *is a critical value. In case* (b)*, the chosen branch* U_r *defines a transcendental singularity over* z*, and it can be shown that* z *is an asymptotic value for* f*.*

A singular value which is not accumulated by other singular values is called an *isolated singularity.* Non-isolated singularities are always asymptotic values, because critical points for f are a discrete set hence can only accumulate at infinity.

Singular values can be critical values, asymptotic values, or both, depending on the selected branch of the inverse. Singular values can also have noncritical preimages. If a is a preimage of s such that f is univalent in a neighborhood of a, we say that a is a regular preimage of s; otherwise, we say that it is a critical preimage. In case (b), we also say that a has a *preimage at infinity* along that given branch.

1.3 Coverings and mapping properties of entire functions

The next lemma is a basic fact in algebraic topology, see for example [Ha] for general theory about coverings.

Lemma 1.3 (Coverings of $\mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbb{D}^*$)**.** *Let* $U \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$*,* $\mathbb{D}$ *be the unit disk and* $\mathbb{D}^* = \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$*.*

(a) If f *is a holomorphic covering from* $U \to \mathbb{D}$*, then* U *is simply connected and* f *is univalent.*

(b) If f *is a holomorphic covering from* $U \to \mathbb{D}^*$*, then either* U *is biholomorphic to* $\mathbb{D}^*$ *and* f *is equivalent to* z^d*, or* U *is simply connected and* f *is the universal covering, hence equivalent to the exponential map.*

Sketch of proof. As f is a covering, the fundamental group of U is a subgroup of the fundamental group of $f(U)$ which is either $\mathbb{D}$ or $\mathbb{D}^*$.

(a) The fundamental group of $f(U) = \mathbb{D}$ is trivial, hence U is simply connected as well and f is a homeomorphism.

(b) The fundamental group of U is a subgroup of the fundamental group of $\mathbb{D}^*$ which is $\mathbb{Z}$, hence it is either trivial or isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. In the first case f is the universal covering and f is equivalent to the exponential map. In the second case, U is the quotient of the upper half plane by a translation, hence $U \sim \mathbb{D}^*$ and f is equivalent to z^d.

□

Corollary 1.4 (Separating branches)**.** *If* f *is a holomorphic map and* $z \in \mathbb{C}$ *is an isolated singularity for* f*, then there is a neighborhood* V *of* z *such that each component of* $f^{-1}(V)$ *is simply connected, and is either unbounded or containing at most one critical point.*

Proof. Let V be any simply connected neighborhood of z such that $V \cap S(f) = \{z\}$ which exists because z is not accumulated by singular values. Let U be a component of $f^{-1}(V)$. By Lemma 1.3, either $f : U \to V$ is univalent, or $f : U \setminus \{f^{-1}(z)\} \to V \setminus \{z\}$ is a covering of $\mathbb{D}^*$. In this case, either U contains exactly one critical point and f is equivalent to z^d, or U is unbounded and simply connected and f is equivalent to the exponential. $\square$

The goal for the rest of this section is to prove Proposition 1 which we restate here for completeness.

Proposition 1.5 (Unbounded preimages of bounded sets)**.** *Let f be an entire function, V a bounded simply connected open set, and U be an unbounded component of $f^{-1}(V)$. Either $\overline{V}$ contains an asymptotic value, or U contains infinitely many critical points and V contains at least two critical values.*

For the proof we need two preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 1.6 (Unbounded preimages have infinite degree)**.** *Let f be an entire function, V a bounded simply connected open set, and U be an unbounded component of $f^{-1}(V)$. If ∂V does not contain asymptotic values, then $f : U \to V$ has infinite degree.*

Proof. Observe that $f : U \setminus f^{-1}(S(f)) \to V \setminus S(f)$ is a covering and has a well defined degree, possibly infinity. Let us assume by contradiction that $f : U \setminus f^{-1}(S(f)) \to V \setminus S(f)$ has finite degree k. As there are no asymptotic values on ∂V, for any $u \in \partial V$ there is a sufficiently small neighborhood whose preimages consist of finitely many bounded topological disks. In fact, we claim that because there are no asymptotic values in ∂V, for any point u in ∂V there is a neighborhood B_u whose preimages under f intersecting U consist of at most k bounded topological disks. This is clear for any $u \in V \setminus S(f)$ by definition of coverings of degree k. For any u which is in ∂V, if some B_u has more than k preimages intersecting U, then points in $V \cap B_u$ also have more than k preimages in U giving a contradiction. Extracting a finite covering from the $\{B_u\}$ by using compactness of ∂V, we obtain a finite covering of ∂U by bounded topological disks, contradicting unboundedness of U. $\square$

Observe that the assumption that ∂V contains no asymptotic values on the boundary is necessary. For example, the preimage under e^z of a disk D containing 0 on the boundary consists of infinitely many unbounded sets mapping univalently to D.

Lemma 1.7. *Let f be an entire function, D_0 be a topological disk, V_0^1, V_0^2 be two disjoint connected components of $f^{-1}(D_0)$. Let $\{D_r\}_{r \geq 0}$ be a sequence of non-degenerate increasing disks, and suppose that for some $\overline{r}$ the connected components V_r^1, V_r^2 of $f^{-1}(D_r)$ which contain V_0^1, V_0^2 respectively are tangent at a point $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Then c is a critical point and its image is on $\partial D_{\overline{r}}$.*

Proof. There are at least four boundary arcs joining at c, while there are exactly two arcs joining at $f(c)$. $\square$

Lemma 1.8. *Let f be an entire function. Let K be a compact set, X be a component of $f^{-1}(K)$, and $z \in K$ an isolated singularity with two distinct preimages in X. Then there exists a singular value $v \in K$, $v \neq z$.*

Observe that the lemma above holds both if z is critical or asymptotic. In any case it claims that z cannot be the only singular value in K.

Proof. If there is $v \in K$, $v \neq z$ which is accumulated by singular values from $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$, then v is an asymptotic value and the lemma is proved. Otherwise, let V be a simply connected neighborhood of K such that $(V \setminus K) \cap S(f) = \emptyset$, and U be the component of $f^{-1}(V)$ containing X. If z is the only singular value in V, then $f : U \setminus f^{-1}(z) \to V \setminus \{z\}$ is a covering of $\mathbb{D}^*$. So by Lemma 1.3, either $f : U \to V$ is univalent hence there cannot be two distinct preimages of z in U, or z is a singular value, and $U \setminus f^{-1}(z) \sim \mathbb{D}^*$ hence again there cannot be two distinct preimages of z in U. ☐

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Because there are no asymptotic values in $\overline{V}$, by Lemma 1.6 f has infinite degree. Let us show that U contains infinitely many critical points. Let $u \in V$ be a regular point: then there is a neighborhood D_0 of u whose preimage under f in U consists of infinitely many topological disks mapped univalently to D_0. Because V is simply connected, it can be exhausted by an increasing sequence of topological disks D_r, $r > 0$, containing D_0. Observe that $f : U \setminus f^{-1}(S(f)) \to V \setminus S(f)$ has infinite degree, while f from any component of $f^{-1}(D_0) \to D_0$ has degree 1. The degree of f restricted to any component of $f^{-1}(D_r)$ is locally constant with respect to r unless ∂D_r contains a singular value, so there must be some $\overline{r}$ such that:

- for $r \leq \overline{r}$, and for any component of $f^{-1}(D_r)$ in U, f has finite degree;
- for all $r > \overline{r}$, and for at least one component of $f^{-1}(D_r)$ in U, f has infinite degree;
- a singular value v belongs to $\partial D_{\overline{r}}$.

Observe that v is not an asymptotic value by assumption, and that for $r = \overline{r}$ f has finite degree on any component of $f^{-1}(D_r)$ in U, so by Lemma 1.6 none of them can be unbounded. It follows that when going through v, infinitely many bounded disks become tangent at a collection of points $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$, which are critical points by Lemma 1.7. As only finitely many components can join at each c_i, there has to be infinitely many critical points. Finally, V has to contain at least 2 singular values by Lemma 1.3 part (b). ☐

1.4 Separating Periodic Fatou Components

This section is self-contained, and its purpose is to give a precise meaning to the hypothesis that 'periodic Fatou components can be separated'.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the class of entire functions with bounded set of singular values, and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ be the class of entire functions which are finite compositions of functions of finite order in $\mathcal{B}$. For this class of functions, it is shown in [R3S] that there are maximal injective curves $g_{\mathbf{s}} : (0, \infty) \to \mathbb{C}$, where $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a labelling for these curves, such that:

- $\lim_{t\to\infty} |f^n(g_{\mathbf{s}}(t))| = \infty \;\; \forall n \geq 0$;
- $\lim_{n\to\infty} |f^n(g_{\mathbf{s}}(t))| = \infty$ uniformly in $[t, \infty)$.

These curves are called *dynamic rays*, or just *rays*. If $\lim_{t\to 0} g_{\mathbf{s}}(t)$ exists, it is said that the ray $g_{\mathbf{s}}$ *lands*. A ray $g_{\mathbf{s}}$ is called *periodic* if for some $k > 0$, $f^k(g_{\mathbf{s}}) \subset g_{\mathbf{s}}$.

It is expected that, unless a periodic ray contains a singular value, it does land, in which case it necessarily has to land at a repelling or parabolic periodic point by the Snail Lemma. This is the case, for example, in polynomial dynamics, and for the exponential family. A sufficient condition for a periodic ray $g_{\mathbf{s}}$ to land (see [F], [Re]) is that

$$g_{\mathbf{s}} \cap \overline{\bigcup_{s\in S(f)} \omega(s)} = \emptyset.$$

A stricter criterion for *all* periodic rays to land is to assume that $\bigcup_{s\in S(f)} \omega(s))$ is bounded.

Under the assumption that $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and that periodic rays land, in [BF, Corollary D] the following result is proven:

Proposition 1.9. *If $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and periodic rays land, any two periodic Fatou components can be separated by two periodic rays landing at the same point, hence their boundaries intersect in at most one point. Moreover there are no Cremer points on the boundary of periodic Fatou components.*

So whenever we refer to the condition that *periodic Fatou components can be separated* we mean that $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and periodic rays land. As a corollary of Proposition 1.9, the next proposition follows ([BF, Corollary E]):

Corollary 1.10 (Preperiodic hidden components)**.** *If f is an entire function such that periodic Fatou components can be separated and such that f has no wandering domains, then any hidden component of a bounded forward invariant Siegel disk is preperiodic to the Siegel disk itself.*

We should add that for functions with finitely many singular values, it is known (see [EL]) that there are no wandering domains, that is that every Fatou component is preperiodic to either an attracting basin, a parabolic basin or a Siegel disk.

2 Proof of Theorems A and B

Let Δ be a bounded forward invariant Siegel disk, and H_i be the bounded components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\Delta}$ (the *hidden components*). By definition,

$$\widehat{\Delta} = \partial\Delta \cup \Delta \cup \bigcup_i H_i.$$

Let $\widetilde{\Delta}$ be the component of $f^{-1}(\widehat{\Delta})$ containing $\widehat{\Delta}$.

The proof of part (1) in Proposition 3 is due to Hermann ([He2]); we present a sketch of the proof for completeness and refer to [CR, Paragraph 4.2] for details. We give a proof of part (2).

Proof of Proposition 3. Since $\widehat{\Delta}$ contains no singular values, and any accumulation point of singular values is itself a singular value, there exists a neighborhood V of $\widehat{\Delta}$ such that $\overline{V} \cap S(f) = \emptyset$, let U be the component of $f^{-1}(V)$ containing $\widetilde{\Delta}$.

(a) By Proposition 1.3, $f : U \to V$ is a homeomorphism hence $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}$. The complement of $\widehat{\Delta}$ can be uniformized to the complement of the unit disk $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and the uniformization map conjugates f to an analytic map g defined in a small annulus around $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Because $\widehat{\Delta}$ is locally backward invariant, using Schwarz reflection's principle g can be extended to an analytic map in a neighborhood of $\mathbb{S}^1$, and its restriction to $\mathbb{S}^1$ is an analytic circle map, which has degree one because f is univalent in a neighborhood of $\widehat{\Delta}$. The rotation number of g can be shown to be the same as the rotation number of Δ; by Hermann's theorem ([He1]), if $\theta \in \mathcal{H}$, g can be linearized via an analytic map. The linearization can be extended to a neighborhood of the Siegel disk contradicting its maximality.

(b) The map f from $U \to V$ is univalent, hence the unique preimage of Δ in U is Δ itself. However any hidden component of $\widehat{\Delta}$ is preperiodic to Δ by Corollary 1.10, so if a hidden component H would exist, there would be n such that $f^n(H) = \Delta$ hence $f^{n-1}(H) \neq \Delta$ is a preimage of Δ in U giving a contradiction.

□

To prove the Fatou Variation and Theorem 4 we use the following lemma, which includes a modification of the proof of a theorem due to Fatou asserting that the boundary of a Siegel disk is contained in the union of the ω-limit set of the set of critical values (see Theorem 11.17 and Corollary 14.4 in [Mi]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let f be an entire function with a bounded invariant Siegel disk Δ. Suppose that there exists a point $z \in \partial\Delta$ and a neighborhood V' of z such that $\omega(s) \cap V' = \emptyset$ for all but finitely many singular values s all of which are in $\partial\Delta$. Then there is at least one critical point on $\partial\Delta$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon = 2\min|s_i - s_j|$ where s_i, s_j are singular values in $\partial\Delta$, and let $z \in \partial\Delta$, and V' be as in the assumption. We first show that there is a neighborhood $V \subset V'$ of z such that for any component U of $f^{-n}(V)$ with $f^n : U \to V$ univalent and satisfying $U \cap \partial\Delta \neq \emptyset$, one has $\operatorname{diam} U < \varepsilon$. If not, there exist $\delta_k \to 0$, and U_k components of $f^{-n_k}(D_{\delta_k}(z))$ such that $U_k \cap \partial\Delta \neq \emptyset$ and $\operatorname{diam} U_k > \varepsilon$. By assumption the inverse branches ϕ_k of f^{n_k} defined as $\phi_k : D_{\delta_k}(z) \to U_k$ are univalent, and for δ_k sufficiently small they all omit three values (say some periodic orbit of cardinality bigger than 3). The maps $\psi_k(w) = \phi_k(\delta_k w + z) : \mathbb{D} \to U_k$ are normal by Montel's Theorem, and they do not converge to infinity because $U_k = \psi_k(\mathbb{D})$ intersects $\partial\Delta$ for all k. So they admit a converging subsequence ψ_{k_j} to a limit function ψ which is not constant because $\operatorname{diam} U_k > \varepsilon$. In particular there is an accumulation point $y \in \partial\Delta$ such that $y \in \psi_{k_j}(\mathbb{D})$ for a subsequence k_j, and because ψ is not constant, there is a neighborhood $\tilde{U}$ of y such that $\tilde{U} \subset \psi_{k_j}(\mathbb{D})$ for large k_j, hence $\psi_{k_j}^{-1}(\tilde{U}) \subset \mathbb{D}$. By definition of ψ_k, $\phi_{k_j}^{-1}(\tilde{U}) = f^{n_{k_j}}(\tilde{U}) \subset D_{\delta_{k_j}}(z) \subset D_{\delta_0}(z)$ contradicting $y \in \mathcal{J}(f)$.

Suppose now that there are no critical points in $\partial\Delta$. Similarly as in the proof of Fatou's Theorem, we will derive a contradiction by showing that there is a family $\{\phi_n\}$ of univalent inverse branches of f^n defined on V. We define $\{\phi_n\}$ inductively as follows. As long as $\phi_n(V) \cap \mathcal{S}(f) = \emptyset$, let ϕ_{n+1} be the pullback of $\phi_n(V)$ along the backward orbit of z in $\partial\Delta$ (such a pullback always exists by surjectivity of $f : \partial\Delta \to \partial\Delta$). If $\phi_n(V)$ intersects $\mathcal{S}(f)$, since $\phi_n(V) < \varepsilon$, it contains a unique singular value v_1 whithout critical preimages in $\partial\Delta$, and ϕ_{n+i} can be defined as the pullback of $\phi_n(V)$ along the backward orbit of v_1 in $\partial\Delta$ until a new singular value is met and so on.

The family $\{\phi_n\}$ is normal because it omits three values and does not go to infinity, so up to passing to a subsequence we can assume that it converges to a univalent function ϕ. As $\phi_n(V \cap \Delta) \subset \Delta$ for all n, $\phi(V \cap \Delta) \subset \Delta$ and ϕ is non-constant (because $\phi(V) \cap \mathcal{J}(f) \neq \emptyset$). Like in the previous argument there is a point $y \in \partial\Delta$ such that a neighborhood of y is mapped into V under infinitely many iterates, contradicting $y \in \mathcal{J}(f)$.

□

Proposition 2.2 (Fatou variation). *Let f be an entire function with a bounded invariant Siegel disk Δ. Suppose that there are only finitely many singular values interacting with Δ, all of which are contained in $\partial\Delta$. Then there is at least one recurrent critical point on $\partial\Delta$.*

Proof. As there are only finitely many singular values interacting with Δ all of which are in $\partial\Delta$, the hypothesis of Lemma 2.1 are satisfied and there is at least one critical point on $\partial\Delta$. The only thing which is left to prove is recurrence. Suppose that there are q critical points $\{c_i\}$ on $\partial\Delta$. Each c_i is accumulated by the iterates of some c_j, otherwise we would get a contradiction following the argument of Lemma 2.1. Let c_1 be any of the critical points in $\partial\Delta$, c_2 be a critical point whose orbit accumulates on c_1, c_3 be a critical point whose orbit accumulates on c_2 and so on. There are only finitely many critical points on $\partial\Delta$, so $c_q = c_n$ for some $n < q$. But then iterates of $c_q = c_n$ accumulate on c_{q-1} whose iterates accumulate on c_{q-2} and so on until c_n , hence by extracting a diagonal sequence of iterates, iterates of c_n accumulate on c_n itself giving recurrence. □

Our Fatou Variation is a weaker form of Mañé's theorem according to which $\partial\Delta \subset \omega(c)$ for a recurrent critical point c.

Proof of Theorem 4. Let S_Δ be the finite set of singular values interacting with Δ. For any singular value $s \notin S_\Delta$ we have that $\omega(s) \cap \partial\Delta = \emptyset$, while for any $s \in S_\Delta \cap F(f)$ by the classification of Fatou components and absence of wandering domain in $\widehat{\Delta}$ either $\omega(s) \cap \partial\Delta$ is empty or it consists of a finite parabolic orbit. So there is a point $z \in \partial\Delta$ be a point which is not contained in $\omega(s)$ for any $s \notin \partial\Delta$ hence satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 2.1. By Lemma 2.1, there is a critical point on $\partial\Delta$. □

Remark 2.3. *In fact, we are showing that the critical point on $\partial\Delta$ is recurrent.*

3 Proof of Theorem 5

We now assume that f has only two interacting singular values v, v', and that periodic Fatou components can be separated. Also, let Δ be a bounded forward invariant Siegel disk for f with rotation number $\theta \in \mathcal{H}$. In this Section we prove that if there is exactly one singular value v in $\widehat{\Delta}$, then there is at least one critical preimage c of v on $\partial\Delta$. Recall that $\widetilde{\Delta}$ denotes the component of $f^{-1}(\widehat{\Delta})$ containing $\widehat{\Delta}$.

If v is a critical value, our setup is equivalent to the one for polynomials and the proof is analogous. We reproduce it here for completeness, referring to [CR] only for a part of the argument which is quite technical and goes through directly in out case. If v is an asymptotic value, an even more direct contradiction can be found.

Lemma 3.1 (Regular preimages)**.** *Let f be an entire function, Δ a bounded Siegel disk for f. Suppose that $S(f)\cap\widehat{\Delta} = \{v\}$ such that v is an isolated singularity and has a regular preimage in $\widetilde{\Delta}$. Then $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}$ and $\theta \notin \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. To show the first claim observe that since v is an isolated singularity there is a simply connected neighborhood V of $\widehat{\Delta}$ such that $\overline{V}\cap S(f) = \{v\}$; let U be the component of $f^{-1}(V)$ containing $\widetilde{\Delta}$. The map $f : U \setminus (f^{-1}(v)) \to V \setminus \{v\}$ is a covering, hence by Lemma 1.3 $f^{-1}(v)$ is a single point. If it is a regular preimage, then $f : U \to V$ is a homeomorphism and $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}$. To show that $\theta \notin \mathcal{H}$, observe that if v has a regular preimage in $\widetilde{\Delta}$, by Proposition 3.1 $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}$. The proof of Proposition 3 can then be repeated to show that $\theta \notin \mathcal{H}$. ☐

The proof of Theorem 5 uses a theorem of Mañé about hyperbolicity of circle maps ([Ma1, Theorem A],[Ma2]).

Theorem 3.2 (Hyperbolicity of circle maps)**.** *Let $g : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{S}^1$ be a C^2 map. Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ be a forward invariant compact set which does not contain critical points or non-repelling periodic points; then either $\Lambda = \mathbb{S}^1$ and g is topologically equivalent to a rotation, or Λ is a hyperbolic set, that is there exist $\overline{k}, \eta > 1$ such that for all $k > \overline{k}$ and all $z \in \Lambda$, $|(f^k)'(z)| > \eta$.*

Proof of Theorem 5. Let $V \supset \widehat{\Delta}$ be a simply connected open set such that $(V\setminus\widehat{\Delta})\cap S(f) = \emptyset$. Let U be the component of the preimage of V which contains $\widehat{\Delta}$. As there is only one singular value $v \in V$, by Lemma 1.8 v has only one preimage in U (possibly, v is an asymptotic value and that preimage is at infinity, and $\widetilde{\Delta}$ is unbounded.).

Recall that

$$\widehat{\Delta} = \partial\Delta \cup \Delta \cup \bigcup_i H_i,$$

and that $f : \partial\Delta \to \partial\Delta$ as well as $f : \Delta \to \Delta$ are surjective. Hence v cannot belong to Δ, or it would need to have a regular preimage in Δ, which by Lemma 3.1 would imply that $\theta \notin \mathcal{H}$. Again by Lemma 3.1 if $v \in \partial\Delta$, the preimage of v in $\partial\Delta$ given by surjectivity of $f|_{\partial\Delta}$ cannot be regular. Since Δ is bounded neither can v have a preimage at infinity on $\partial\Delta$. So either $v \in \partial\Delta$ is a critical value and has a critical preimage on $\partial\Delta$, in which case there is nothing else to prove, or $v \in H_v$ for some hidden component H_v. If the latter occurred, v could be either critical or asymptotic but, by the discussion above v has a unique preimage in $\widetilde{\Delta}$ and this is not regular. The rest of the proof is devoted to show that the condition $v \in H_v$ leads to a contradiction.

Case 1: The preimage of v is at infinity. This implies that v is an asymptotic value. Necessarily $\widetilde{\Delta}$ and hence U are unbounded. Call Δ_i the components of $f^{-1}(\Delta)$ which are contained in U. The Δ_i's are all preimages of the same bounded set under a holomorphic map, so they do not accumulate on any compact set. Thus showing that $\Delta_i \subset \widehat{\Delta}$ for infinitely many $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ would contradict boundedness of $\widehat{\Delta}$.

Since v is the only singular value in V it follows from Lemma 1.3 part (b) that the map $f : U \to V \setminus \{v\}$ is equivalent to the exponential map. The map $z \to e^z$ has a transitive infinite cyclic group of automorphisms which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$ (generated by translations by $2\pi i$); hence f also has a transitive infinite cyclic group of automorphisms G generated by some element $\rho \in G$. Up to labelling, $\Delta_i = \rho^i \Delta$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Corollary 1.10, H_v is preperiodic to Δ. Also $\widehat{\Delta}$ is forward invariant, so $f^n(v) \in f^n(H_v)$ is mapped from one hidden component to another until it reaches Δ. In particular, at the iterate just before entering Δ, the asymptotic value v belongs to a direct preimage Δ_m of Δ, which is also a hidden component of $\widehat{\Delta}$. By Proposition 1.1 part (1), $\Delta_m = \rho^m(\Delta) \subset \widehat{\Delta} \Rightarrow \widehat{\rho^m(\Delta)} \subset \widehat{\Delta}$, and by Proposition 1.1 part (2) since ρ^m is a homeomorphism, $\rho^m(\widehat{\Delta}) = \widehat{\rho^m(\Delta)}$ so $\rho^m(\widehat{\Delta}) \subset \widehat{\Delta}$.

Now, for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\rho^{mq}\widehat{\Delta} = \rho^{m(q-1)}\rho^m\widehat{\Delta} \subset \rho^{m(q-1)}\widehat{\Delta} \subset \ldots \subset \widehat{\Delta}$$

But then, for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $\rho^{mq}\Delta \subset \rho^{mq}\widehat{\Delta} \subset \widehat{\Delta}$. It follows that there are infinitely many $\Delta_i \subset \widehat{\Delta}$ contradicting boundedness of $\widehat{\Delta}$.

Case 2: The preimage of v is a finite critical point. Then $\widetilde{\Delta}$ is bounded by Proposition 1.5, and $f : U \to V$ is proper; moreover, by Lemma 1.3 part (b), f is equivalent to z^d.

This case is totally analogous to the polynomial case which was proven in [CR]. Indeed observe that the transcendentality of f plays no role in this setup which can be solved with a local approach. Nevertheless we include the main ideas here for completeness.

The idea of the proof is the following: we first show that $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}$, then uniformize $\mathbb{C} \setminus \widehat{\Delta}$ to find a conjugate map which extends to an analytic circle map of some degree d. We show that the periodic cycles of the induced circle map are all repelling by using the fact that if there existed a nonrepelling one, the remaining singular value would have to both be attracted to the nonrepelling cycle and accumulate on $\partial\Delta$- which is a contradiction. We can then use Theorem 3.2 to deduce that f has a polynomial-like restriction in U and conclude the proof using the Second Herman's theorem about unicritical polynomials or from Theorem 4.

The first goal is to show that $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}$. Because there is a unique singular value in $\widehat{\Delta}$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}$ is bounded, by Lemma 1.3 part (b), f is equivalent to z^d and has a cyclic symmetry group G isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$, say G, generated by some element ρ. Like before let $\Delta_i = \rho^i(\Delta)$ denote the preimages of Δ in U. By Proposition 1.1 part (3), $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widehat{\bigcup \Delta_i}$. Using Corollary 1.10, like in the case where v is asymptotic we can find a direct preimage Δ_m of Δ which is contained in $\widehat{\Delta}$. If c is a simple critical point, this concludes the proof that $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}$, because there are exactly two preimages Δ and Δ' of Δ and both are contained in $\widehat{\Delta}$. If c has a higher multiplicity, the proof that $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}$ is analogous to the polynomial case so we refer to [CR, Paragraphs 4.7.3-4.7.5] for details.

Now, as in the proof of Proposition 3, the complement of $\widehat{\Delta}$ can be uniformized to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ via a holomorphic map Φ, in order to get an analytic map g defined in a neighborhood of $\mathbb{S}^1$, such that $g|_{\mathbb{S}^1}$ is an analytic circle map of degree d with no critical points (the condition of having no critical points is where backward invariance of $\widehat{\Delta}$ is crucial). As g is conjugate to

f in a small neighborhood of the unit disk, using the fact that the local degree of f is d, it can be shown that also g has degree exactly d on $\mathbb{S}^1$ ([CR, Lemma 18]). Now suppose that g has a point x of period q in $\mathbb{S}1$, with $(f^q)'(x) \leq 1$. Since g preserves the unit circle, either $|g'(x)| < 1$ or $g'(x) = e^{2\pi i \alpha}$ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$. In both cases there is an open set of points that tend to x under iteration of g, whose pullback under Φ is an open set B of points tending to $\partial\Delta$ under iteration of f. It follows that B is a subset of a periodic Fatou component for f, which is either attracting or parabolic. Then the orbit $f^n(B)$ has to contain a singular value, which has to be v' because $f^n(v) \in \Delta$. But then, all singular values are in the Fatou set, contradicting Fatou's theorem because of the absence of wandering domains.

So there are no non-repelling periodic points on $\mathbb{S}^1$ and g is hyperbolic on $\mathbb{S}^1$, hence there is a neighborhood U_ε of $\mathbb{S}^1$ which is mapped outside itself under g. Using Φ^{-1}, the set $U_\varepsilon \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}})$ can be pulled back to the dynamical plane of f to get a neighborhood U_f of $\widehat{\Delta}$ which is mapped outside itself under f, making the restriction of f to U_f a polynomial-like map with a unique critical point c. Then by Fatou's theorem, $\partial\Delta \subset \omega(c)$ and hence $c \in \mathcal{J}(f)$ (again by the absence of wandering domains), contradicting that $c \in H_v$.

$\square$

References

[BF] A. M. Benini, N. Fagella, *A separation theorem for entire functions.* Preprint (2011) arXiv:1112.0531.

[BeF] R. Berenguel, N. Fagella, *An entire transcendental family with a persistent Siegel disk*, J. Difference Equ. Appl., **16** (2010), 523-553.

[BE] W. Bergweiler, A.Eremenko, *On the singularities of the inverse of a meromorphic function of finite order*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **11** (1995), no. 2, 355-373.

[Bi] C. J. Bishop, *Constructiong entire functions by quasiconformal folding.* Preprint. http://www.math.sunysb.edu/∼bishop/papers/classS.pdf

[CR] A. Chéritat, P. Roesch, *Herman's condition and Siegel disks of polynomials.* Preprint (2011), ArXiv:111.4629v1.

[D] A. Douady, *Disques de Siegel et anneaux de Herman*, Astérisque, **152-153** (1987), 151–172.

[EL] A. Eremenko, M. Lyubich, *Dynamical properties of some classes of entire functions*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **42** (1992), no. 4, 989–1020.

[F] N. Fagella, *Dynamics of the complex standard family*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **229** (1999), no.1, 1–31.

[Gh] E. Ghys, *Transformations holomorphes au voisinage dune courbe de Jordan*, C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris **289** (1984), 383–388

[GK] L. Goldberg, L. Keen, *A finiteness theorem for a dynamical class of entire functions*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **6** (1986) no.2, 183–192.

[GM] L. Goldberg, J. Milnor, *Fixed points of polynomial maps. Part II. Fixed point portraits*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **26** (1993), no. 1, 51–98.

[GS] J. Graczyk, G. Światek *Siegel disks with critical points on their boundaries,* Duke Math. J. **119** (2003), no.3, 189–196 .

[Ha] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic topology.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[He1] M.-R. Herman, *Sur la conjugaison différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle á des rotations*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math., (1979), no.49, 5–233 .

[He2] M. R. Herman, *Are there critical points on the boundaries of singular domains?* Comm. Math. Phys. **99** (1985), no. 4, 593-612.

[He3] M. Herman, *Conjugaison quasi-symétrique des homeomorphismes analytiques du cercels à des rotations*, manuscript 1987.

[Iv] F. Iversen, *Recherches sur les fonctions inverses*, Comptes Rendus **143** (1906), 877–879; Math Werke, no. 1, 655-656.

[Ma1] R. Mañé, *Hyperbolicity, sinks and measure in one-dimensional dynamics*, Comm. Math. Phys., **100** (1985), no. 4 495–524 .

[Ma2] R. Mañé, *Erratum: Hyperbolicity, sinks and measure in one-dimensional dynamics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **112** (1987), no. 4, 721–724 .

[Ma3] R. Mañé, *On a theorem of Fatou.* Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. (N.S.) **24** (1993), no. 1, 1–11.

[Mi] J. Milnor, *Dynamics in one complex variable*, Annals of Mathematics Studies (2006), Princeton University Press.

[Re] L. Rempe, *Siegel disks and periodic rays of entire functions*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **624** (2008), 81–102.

[RvS] L. Rempe, S. Van Strien, *Absence of line fields and Mañé's theorem for non-recurrent transcendental functions.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), no. 1, 203–228.

[R3S] G. Rottenfusser, J. Rückert, L. Rempe, D. Schleicher, *Dynamic rays of bounded-type entire functions*, Annals of Mathematics **173** (2010), 77–125.

[Ro] J. T. Rogers, *Diophantine conditions imply critical points on the boundaries of Siegel disks of polynomials*, Comm. Math. Phys. **195** (1998), no. 1, 175–193.

[S] G. Świątek, *Rational Rotation Numbers for Maps of the Circle*, Comm. Math. Phys., **119** (1988), 109–128.

[Z1] S. Zakeri, *Dynamics of cubic Siegel polynomials*, Comm. Math. Phys., **206** (1999), 185–233.

[Z2] S. Zakeri, *On Siegel disks of a class of entire maps*, Duke Math J. **152** (2010), 481–532.

[Zh] G. Zhang, *All bounded type Siegel disks of rational maps are quasidisks*, Ivent. Math. **185** (2011), 421–466..

[Yo] J.-C. Yoccoz, *Analytic linearization of circle diffeomorphisms.* Dynamical systems and small divisors (Cetraro, 1998), volume 1784 of *Lecture notes in Math.*, Springer, Berlin (2002), 125–173.

[Yn] K. Yoneyama, *Theory of Continuous Set of Points*, Tohoku Math. J. **12** (1917), 43–158.